1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 12 ROBERT REGINALD ESTRADA, 13 Petitioner, No. C 06-4780 CRB (PR) ORDER OF DISMISSAL 14 VS. 15 PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al., 16 Respondent(s). 17 18 19 Petitioner, a state prisoner currently incarcerated at the Santa Clara County 20 Jail, seeks a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 challenging a December 28, 2005 judgment of conviction from the Superior Court of the State 21 22 of California in and for the County of Santa Clara. 23 Prisoners in state custody who wish to challenge collaterally in federal 24 habeas corpus proceedings either the fact or length of their confinement are first 25 required to exhaust state judicial remedies, either on direct appeal or through 26 collateral proceedings, by presenting the highest state court available with a fair 27 opportunity to rule on the merits of each and every claim they seek to raise in 28 federal court. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)-(c). Petitioner has not done so. He has

1	not presented the Supreme Court of California with an opportunity to consider
2	and rule on his claims. See O'Sullivan v. Boerckel, 526 U.S. 838, 845 (1999)
3	(state's highest court must be given opportunity to rule on claims even if review
4	is discretionary); <u>Larche v. Simons</u> , 53 F.3d 1068, 1071-72 (9th Cir. 1995)
5	(Supreme Court of California must be given at least one opportunity to review
6	state prisoners' federal claims). The petition for a writ of habeas corpus tmust be
7	DISMISSED without prejudice to refiling after state judicial remedies are
8	exhausted.
9	The clerk shall close the file and terminate all pending motions as moot.
10	SO ORDERED.
11	DATED: August 18, 2006
12	CHARLES R. BREYER United States District Judge
13	
14	
15	